

4.6 Alternative 5

Natural Environment (4.6.1)

EARTH (4.6.1.1)

This alternative limits timber harvesting to thinning, designed to accelerate development of old forest conditions, of stands 60 years old or younger. A total of 2,044 acres would be available for thinning under this alternative. No timber harvesting will occur within 7,897 acres of unstable and potentially unstable slopes and adjacent buffers. The area in riparian buffers increases to approximately 1,758 acres. The size of the areas identified as inaccessible increases to 3,994 acres because no new roads will be constructed under this alternative and no harvesting will occur in stands older than 60 years of age.

Impacts on Slope Stability

Potential impacts from slope instability along existing roads would be similar to Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 4. Because no new roads would be constructed on private land to provide access for timber harvest on DNR land under this alternative, impacts from new roads constructed for this purpose would be eliminated.

No harvesting related slope stability impacts are expected since no harvesting would occur on unstable or potentially unstable slopes and harvesting would be limited to thinning.

Impacts on Erosion

Localized surface erosion resulting from timber harvest on stable slopes would be reduced from Alternative 4 proportionally to the 45 percent reduction in harvest area, and would occur only where mineral soil was exposed by log skidding and other harvest activities.

Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impacts from implementation of this alternative would be the least of all the alternatives. Most of the sediment deliverable to public resources would originate from existing roads within the area.

Additional Mitigation Measures

Sediment from roads could be reduced further if roads and drainage ditches were paved, which would reduce erosion.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Use of existing roads will result in some minor sedimentation during wet weather.

AIR (4.6.1.2)Climate/Air Quality

Short-term impacts only. Harvest activity is limited to restoration thinning, which eliminates any impacts from silvicultural burning and minimal dust. The potential exists for more impacts from wildfire smoke, due to fewer access roads, and less activity and therefore slower detection of wildfire starts (i.e., slower response time.)

WATER (4.6.1.3)Surface Water Quality

No new roads are allowed under Alternative 5, so sediment delivered to surface water may be slightly less than under Alternative 4.

Surface Water Quantity

Thinning is the only timber harvest under Alternative 5. As timber stands mature, there will be no measurable increases in water yield due to harvesting. However, the difference in water yield from this alternative and what would be produced under Alternative 4 is insignificant.

Groundwater Quality

There is no further mitigation for groundwater quality under this alternative.

Groundwater Quantity

See discussion of surface water quantity.

Public water supply

The influences of actions on Lake Whatcom under this alternative would not be significantly different than those of Alternative 4.

PLANTS AND ANIMALS (4.6.1.4)Forest Vegetation: Upland, Riparian, Wetland*Upland Vegetation: General Forest Ecology Perspective**Short-term Impacts: Direct & Indirect*

Stand development has not been modeled for Alternative 5, however it is probably safe to assume that the stand development ratios would not be too different in the first decade from Alternative 4. The perceptible impacts would be that some stands that under the other alternatives would be harvested would not be harvested, and some stands younger than typical harvest age would be thinned.

For those stands that are thinned, tree growth will accelerate, and understory will develop with greater species diversity.

Long-term Impacts: Direct & Indirect

The long-term effects of this strategy are related to the rate of change in forest stand development. Older stands would continue to mature at biologically and climatically controlled rates, but some younger stands would have their development accelerated by removal of some of their volume.

In stands that had been thinned, mature forest characteristics such as canopy gaps, snags and fallen logs would increase in numbers sooner than they would have in the other alternatives.

Younger seral stages would begin to disappear over time, maintained only by natural events such as windthrow and/or wildfire. The scale of these changes is difficult to predict. Fewer openings will limit the edge blowdown seen today; suppression of wildfire could also lessen the natural number and size of openings. The alternatives do not address wildfire management.

This alternative, like Alternative 2, 3 and 4, promotes an older forest ecosystem.

Cumulative Impacts

No negative cumulative effects are identified, other than the potential for an undetermined period where younger habitats are under represented.

Additional Mitigation Measure

None needed from the broader forest ecology perspective.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

There would be no unavoidable adverse impacts.

Riparian and Wetland Vegetation: General Forest Ecology Perspective*Short-term Impacts: Direct & Indirect*

As with the other alternatives, there could possibly be some adverse impacts to small, unidentified isolated wetlands due to forest management activities. Impacts could include disruption of hydrology, and disturbances to soils and vegetation.

However, not of these are considered probable at a scale of significant adverse impacts.

Long-term Impacts: Direct & Indirect

The potential long-term impacts to small, unidentified wetlands are similar to Alternative 3 and 4. However, the risk of this disturbance is less due to less harvest activity.

If wetland acreage were lost, the water quality and habitat functions of the wetland would also be destroyed.

Cumulative Impacts

No significant adverse cumulative impacts are expected for this alternative because of the spatially and temporally restricted entries.

Additional Mitigation Measures

No need for mitigation at the broader landscape-level forest ecology. Mitigation for impacts to small wetlands is essentially the same as for alternative 4.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Impacts on small wetlands, but minimal since harvest is limited to restoration thinning and even that will not be carried out indefinitely.

Forest Health: Insects and Disease (Alt 5)*Short- and Long-term Impacts: Direct & Indirect*

Mature forests tend to have higher levels of insect and disease activity than those managed for younger trees and higher vigor. These insects and diseases do not threaten traditional commercial productivity because commercial activity is not desired or allowed in this alternative. There may be cases where specific resources or habitats or structures are threatened by a native insect or disease, but the general ecosystem is not at risk. Stands will age, become more structurally complex, and become less dominated by Douglas-fir over time. Concentrations of logs and snags will increase.

When desired, forest insects and diseases can be actively used to accelerate development of older conditions through tree killing (baiting) or snag enhancement using decay fungi. These treatments vary in cost.

Cumulative Impacts

Same as Alternative 4.

Additional Mitigation Measures

In the most extreme potential case of an aggressive, exotic pest being detected in the Lake Whatcom landscape, not unlikely due to proximity to Bellingham and Vancouver Ports, the Washington State Department of Agriculture could obtain legal access and use chemical tools in this watershed regardless of local preferences or policy. Therefore, risk to the larger ecosystem could likely be avoided.

Some characteristics of pre-European settlement older forests will unlikely develop or persist in the Lake Whatcom area. True fir trees (*Abies* species) are at risk of an exotic insect called the balsam woolly adelgid and will likely decline in number and presence over time. At this time, there is no effective passive treatment available for maintaining low levels of *Abies* over time. Western white pine is also at diminishing numbers in the Lake Whatcom area due to lack of seed sources and the exotic disease white pine blister rust. As surviving trees continue to decline in number, replacing them with rust resistant trees on appropriate sites would preserve this aspect of the native ecosystem.

Snag and hazard tree removal will be necessary around places people recreate in order to ensure their safety and reduce liability to DNR.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

None identified.

Rare and Sensitive Plants

Same as Alternative 2.

Animals *Habitat Availability (quality, quantity, accessibility)*

The same species-by-species protection identified under Alternative 1 applies to Alternative 4.

Short-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

Alternative 5 would be more likely to retain a prominent hardwood component on the landscape, at least in the short-term. This alternative does not specify an accelerated conversion of mature hardwood stands, although it could be interpreted that some conversion might be accomplished through “restorative thinnings”. However, most of the stands that have been identified under this alternative to be available for such thinnings are not located in areas that are dominated by hardwoods. “Thinning” is a key term, also, as it would not result in an immediate and total loss of hardwood trees in these stands. This lack of aggressive conversion would have a positive short-term, indirect benefit (compared to Alternatives 1-4) to species associated with hardwood-dominated stands. These include a number of neotropical migratory birds.

No analysis was conducted for seral stages or life forms for Alternative 5. However, most of the areas identified as available for harvest correspond between Alternative 4 and 5, with one significant block that would not be available under Alternative 5. This block is located in the northeastern portion of the planning area, immediately to the northeast of Lake Whatcom. Therefore, there would likely be even fewer short-term alterations to existing stand conditions under Alternative 5 than there would be under Alternative 4. The alterations that would occur would also not ever involve conversion from mature forest to early seral stages, whereas Alternative 4 would theoretically allow some regeneration harvests. [One exception would be natural disturbances from wind or fire.]

A key (short-term and long-term) difference for Alternative 5 compared to Alternatives 3 and 4 is the fact that it would only require surveying following PHS guidelines *in areas where thinnings are planned*. This would be more efficient than Alternatives 3 and 4, and would have less of an impact on personnel resources. This would, in turn, make it more likely to provide effective mitigation for some species of interest, such as the northern goshawk and pileated woodpecker.

Long-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

The long-term impacts for species associated with hardwoods are more difficult to predict under this alternative, as it is unknown what type of silvicultural treatment (if any) might be considered as “restorative

thinning” in a mature hardwood stand. Site-specific conditions would need to be considered with regard to plantings and/or natural regeneration, and how they relate to the type of stands that would be expected to occur naturally through stand succession. As mentioned above, most stands identified for potential thinning are not located in areas that are currently dominated by hardwoods. Hardwood-dominated stands that are not altered through harvest would follow various pathways of succession, depending on site conditions, natural disturbances, and adjacent human-caused alterations.

Another indirect impact of Alternative 5 (both short-term and long-term), compared to Alternative 1, would be the *lack* of effects from road construction, as well as effects from harvesting in the majority of the planning area. There are very few stands that would be available for restorative thinning (considering distance from existing roads and stands younger than 60 years old). These are primarily located near the edges of the planning area boundary, in the hills or higher elevations.

It could be assumed that the long-term trend in seral stage distribution for Alternative 5 would be the most similar to Alternative 4, due to the higher level of restrictions under the latter. One key difference for Alternative 5 would be a more rapid elimination of early seral stages across the landscape (the predicted timing is unknown, since no analysis was conducted).

Cumulative Impacts

Alternative 5 is most notably different from Alternative 1. Because of the preclusion of road construction, the areas described under “Affected Environment, Forest Habitats” as contiguous, mature forest would remain relatively unaffected by roads and associated activities. Therefore, the impacts from roads, including human disturbance, would be dramatically minimized, and eventually even *reversed* under Alternative 5. This would have a positive impact on many wildlife species, including interior forest species.

The contribution to wildlife from the limited amount of “restorative thinning” that would be possible under this alternative is questionable, particularly when so many surrounding stands would not be available for treatments. Some of these surrounding stands might benefit from variable silvicultural treatments. For example, in some places small, well-designed openings could help create a greater variety and mosaic of habitat types, which would likely enhance overall wildlife diversity. Access issues would preclude such treatments. Under Alternative 5, small openings would likely develop naturally, but over a much longer period of time. Whether the changes in stand-level conditions within the limited number

of stands available for thinning would be considered an “improvement” or a positive impact would depend on the existing stand conditions, as well as the target wildlife species habitat that the “restorative thinnings” would be intended to “restore” or enhance.

Additional Mitigation Measures

None identified.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

None identified.

Fish

Habitat Quality & Quantity

Alternative 5 is a forest restoration approach that does not focus on revenue generation. The initial focus is on accelerating the development of old-forest conditions and/or important cultural vegetation, through strategic thinnings. One can say with the greatest certainty that this alternative will maintain a high level of protection of the RMZs and consequently have the highest success in protecting riparian ecosystem function. However, the true quantitative difference between Alternative 5 and Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 is unknown.

Short-term Impacts: Indirect

Because this alternative does not allow harvest, it could limit the rate of recovery of “older forest conditions”. This means that the second growth forest stands may be overstocked with small diameter conifer trees for an extended period of time.

Cumulative Impacts

Same as the other alternatives; however, the likelihood of impacts are minimal.

Mitigation

Allowing some harvest in the RMZ could restore old-forest conditions in the RMZ more quickly.

Unavoidable adverse impacts

Since no road construction or harvest will occur, no unavoidable adverse impacts have been identified.

Habitat Accessibility

Same as the other alternatives.

ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES (4.6.1.5)**Energy Resources**

No change from Alternative 4.

Mineral resources (sand, gravel, rock, metallic minerals)

No change from Alternative 4.

Forest resources (timber, special forest products)***Timber Resources***

No harvest will occur under this scenario except for minor restorative harvests, which could be conducted on about 13% of the landscape.

Short-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

Any activities would be restricted to existing roads. What is available under this alternative is mostly accessible with the existing roads network. Over one third of the available stands have already been commercially thinned and pre-commercially thinned.

Long-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

The dominant component of stands will change over time to shade tolerant species such as hemlock and cedar. Douglas fir and alder will be reduced.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are shown in the following table.

Table 17 (repeated): Timber Resources - Cumulative impacts of each alternative. (Same as Table 7 & 14.)

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Available acres for harvest or restoration activities	11,222	8,016	5,133	3,740	2,044
Percent of 15,657-acre planning area	72	51	33	24	13
Draft average annual harvest per decade (mbf/year)	5,511	2,733	492	428	N/A
Draft average Harvest Volume (mbf/acre)	37	30	9	16	N/A
Draft annual acreage treated as regeneration harvests	89	43	0	0	N/A
Draft average annual acreage treated as thinning harvests	47	35	18	16	N/A
Draft annual average acreage treated as partial cut harvests	11	13	11	9	N/A

Additional Mitigation Measures

Mitigation to the Trusts for reduced availability of this commercial resource could come through alternative revenue sources. However, a great deal of uncertainty still surround these. This would not provide any relief to the local economies linked to the forest industry or local and national wood supply.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

There are almost no timber resources available under this alternative.

*Special Forest Products**Short term Impacts: Direct & Indirect*

Vehicular access is lowest under this option. Acreage immediately available for the harvesting of commercial forest products would be limited to the economic working radius from existing roads.

Long-term Impacts: Direct & Indirect

Similar to Alternatives 3 and 4, vegetation more tolerant of shade and in older forests will be favored by this alternative. Products needing full sunlight and open areas may not be available in sufficient quantities. Fungal species

needing maintenance of deeper, undisturbed layers of organic matter and would be favored by this alternative. Quality and quantity of moss species found in conifer stands is likely to increase although moss associated with alder stands will diminish.

Cumulative Impacts

While the availability and quality of some products may be enhanced, their value may not be realized due to limited road access.

Possible conflicts with Native American traditional uses of medicinal plants may impact any commercial harvesting

Additional Mitigation Measures

Same as Alternative 1.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

None identified at this time.

Conservation/preservation (carbon sequestration)

The rate of carbon sequestration is highest in younger trees. Under Alternative 5, with the exception of some restoration harvest, the forests would likely provide a long-term sink for atmospheric carbon. Restoration harvests would provide some young trees that would more actively remove additional carbon from the atmosphere.

Built Environment (4.6.2)

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH (4.6.2.1)

Release of Toxics/Hazardous Materials

No significant adverse impacts likely.

Risk of Explosion/Fires

Same as Alternative 4, similar to Alternative 1, 2 and 3.

Risk of Slides, Floods, Debris Flows

Short-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

The potential for short-term impacts to the built environment under Alternative 5, like Alternative 1 through 4, is minimal. Alternative 5 does reduce the risk to road structures by reducing the number of miles of roads (less new road construction).

Long-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

Same as Alternative 3, but with fewer road miles at risk of damage.

Cumulative Impacts

Similar to Alternative 4, but with slightly reduced cost of reconstructing roads.

Additional Mitigation Measures

Same as Alternative 1.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Same as Alternative 1.

Spiritual & Emotional Health

No known impacts. See “Affected Environment” discussion.

LAND & SHORELINE USE (4.6.2.2)

Existing land use plans/growth estimates

No change from Alternative 1.

Residential and commercial development

No change from Alternative 1.

Aesthetics

All five alternatives include an objective to “reduce the visual impact of forest management activities in high visibility areas as shown on Map S-1” (See Appendix C.) In addition, many citizens raised the question of visual impacts in their scoping comments. This analysis looks primarily at those areas identified as having “high” and “medium” potential for visual impacts as viewed from six different residential communities.

Short- and Long-term Impacts: Direct

Alternative 5 is designed to create a largely forested landscape, with only restoration thinnings. Visual impacts should not be an issue under this alternative.

Cumulative Impacts

Current visual impacts from forest management activities will be substantially reduced over time, resulting in positive cumulative results for those who dislike seeing such activities.

Additional Mitigation Measures

None identified.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No potentially significant adverse impacts identified.

Recreation*Short- and Long-term Impacts: Direct*

Access throughout the area by recreational users (horse rider, hiker, mountain biker) will likely be further diminished due to the abandonment existing roads and/or the reduced amount of new roads.

With large areas that are not harvested for timber, there will be less evidence of human impact. For most users this would be an enhancement of their recreational experience.

As there are fewer roads in the forest that are available for recreation users, access may become more limited and users may be more concentrated on fewer trails or roads. Concentrated use may require additional management or maintenance of roads or trails to reduce erosion and sediment impacts, particularly at stream crossings. The collection of fees for possible recreation use might be better facilitated.

The amount of enforcement, particularly to discourage off-road vehicle use is not expected to increase since access to major forest road systems are currently blocked by gates in cooperation with other major landowners. Education and enforcement activities may be able to be done more effectively and efficiently due to the concentration of use.

Historic & Cultural Preservation

Alternative 5 is the same as Alternatives 3 and 4, although additional cultural resource properties would be incidentally protected through increased natural resource preservation.

Agriculture

Not applicable: DNR holdings in the planning area typically are zoned for commercial forestry. The planning area contains no lands specifically designated as agricultural lands under the Whatcom County Comprehensive Plan.

Silviculture

This alternative restricts silvicultural activities to restoration thinnings.

Short-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

No regeneration or brush control activities would occur.

Long-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

Stands eligible for precommercial thinnings would be limited to those proximate to active roads. Stands available for precommercial thinning will disappear after 30 years.

Cumulative Impacts

This option effectively eliminates the practice of silviculture on the project area.

Additional Mitigation Measures

None identified.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

None identified.

TRANSPORTATION (4.6.2.3)

Transportation Systems

The transportation system, under Alternatives 1, 2, 3 and 4, is in place primarily for commercial forest management, with some use allowed for leases and recreation. The nature of road system needed for this restoration and maintenance proposal is not fully outlined. For example, will roads be maintained in some locations for recreational access or fire suppression even though not needed for silvicultural activities?

Alternative 5 mitigates any potential problems from road construction. It also eliminates existing high maintenance segments on unstable and potentially unstable slopes, which would also lead to abandonment of roads beyond those segments. Much of the rest of the existing road network could be abandoned once all the stand restoration harvests have been completed. The total length of active roads would be greatly reduced, providing much less need for maintenance.

Alternative 5 requires abandonment of existing moderate- to high- risk roads on unstable and potentially unstable slopes. Since re-routing these road segments in a new location would not be allowed, this would render any roads beyond these points inaccessible. It would dictate abandoning not only the segment of road on unstable or potentially unstable slopes, but also all roads beyond that point. The Lookout Mountain mainline, Olsen Creek mainline, and the H-4000 road off of Park Road would be almost entirely abandoned.

Short-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

If a road infrastructure is still desired under Alternative 5, a new road system that meets the needs and constraints of the alternative will need to be planned.

Abandonment of road systems with existing easements would prevent further road access to neighboring property or for utility maintenance.

Long-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

New easements with neighboring landowners that would require new road construction would not be allowed.

The haul of logs and rock would be infrequent under this alternative. For the first 60 years, there would be stands requiring restoration harvests. This would generate a limited number of truck trips.

Cumulative Impacts

Potential for cumulative impacts from roads should be great reduced. However, cumulative impacts on the road infrastructure are significant and will require re-planning the road network.

Additional Mitigation Measures

Some easement access lost due to road abandonment could be replaced with alternative access agreements, where opportunities exist.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Some roads would still have management uses even after all restoration harvests have been completed. These roads would remain active. Recreational access is not addressed in the proposal, but there may well be greater pressure for such access to trailheads for hiking through the maturing forest.

Access to replace easements displaced by road abandonment may not be possible in all situations.

Forest Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plans

The timeline for completing the Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan is the same as Alternative 2.

Short-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

Since many miles of roads would be abandoned under this alternative, it would take a substantial effort to finish work by the two-year deadline. This would draw DNR resources away from other maintenance and abandonment projects outside the watershed, increasing the potential for damage to or failure of roads to occur in other locations.

Long-term Impacts: Direct and Indirect

The maintenance work done to existing roads would be more limited in scope than Alternative 4 because reconstruction is allowed only for conducting restoration work. What work would be considered reconstruction versus maintenance is uncertain, but repairs likely could not expand the existing road prism or re-route the road in a new location. This would limit the options for repair work.

Cumulative Impacts

None identified at this time.

Additional Mitigation Measures

If a road segment could not be adequately repaired within the limits of this alternative, that road could be abandoned.

Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The increased potential for road damage or failure outside the watershed due to the shift in DNR resources is unavoidable under current funding scenarios.

Traffic Hazards/Safety

Hauling under Alternative 5 is minimal. No significant adverse impacts relative the traffic and safety are expected.

Water, Rail and Air Traffic

Same as Alternative 3. There would be minimal air traffic in the form of helicopters used for logging on DNR-managed lands

PUBLIC SERVICES & UTILITIES (4.6.2.4)Relation to Trust Income

There is no objective, under Alternative 5, to produce income for the trusts through timber harvest. One hundred percent of the land's productive capacity is dedicated for ecological and social benefits, with any revenue being incidental to silvicultural activities associated with habitat enhancement.¹ Elimination of timber harvest and the limitation of communication site leases to currently existing sites would greatly reduce revenue.

Financial data were only available for the first four scenarios (1 through 4) for this PDEIS. No land management modeling was undertaken for the fifth alternative, so for the purposes of this comparison, it was assumed that net harvest revenues were zero under Alternative 5 and further, that no management costs unrelated to timber harvest were incurred under this alternative. In effect, the net present value (NPV) for Alternative 5 was assumed to be zero, an assumption that tends to overstate the actual NPV for the alternative since some, rather than no, active management is actually proposed under this alternative.

Using this estimation process, a financial analysis suggests that, in present value terms, Alternative 5 will return between \$1,560,000 per year and \$1,729,000 per year less than Alternative 1 (to the state general fund for public services and the direct support of county junior taxing districts, and the department's management fund), depending on the annual real discount rate (which ranged from 4% to 10% in the analysis (Glass, 2002)).²

Analysis was completed for carbon sequestration, green certification and recreation leasing:

¹ For the percent of acres constrained relative to timber harvest for each trust under each alternative, see the graph under "Relation to Trust Income" in Alternative 1.

² These results include only timber revenues captured by the department, and are based on an analysis that assumed the services of the land were obtained for no cost. Therefore the results should be interpreted as a financial analysis rather than either an economic or benefit-cost analysis.

Carbon sequestration: Insufficient data were available to analyze returns to carbon sequestration for Alternative 5 relative to the Alternative 1 (Glass, 2002). However, based on results obtained comparing Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 with Alternative 1, it is likely that the cost of carbon sequestered under Alternative 5 also will be very high compared with the alternative of deliberately planting bare land for carbon sequestration purposes.

Green certification: Offsetting revenue from production of certified wood products is not logically possible under Scenario 5. (Glass, 2002).

Recreation leasing: None of the alternatives proposes a destination resort on state trust lands near the shores of Lake Whatcom. However, because this would generate some of the highest recreation returns, it was used as a test case, to see if recreation income could effectively offset reductions in timber revenues. Estimated lease revenues from a hypothesized destination resort development on the shores of Lake Whatcom are unlikely to completely offset timber harvest revenues forgone under Alternative 5. (Glass, 2002).

Finally, it appears highly unlikely that combined revenues from carbon sequestration, certified lumber production, and leasing of trust land for recreation activities could financially justify the choice of Alternative 5 over Alternative 1. (Glass, 2002)

Fire

No change from Alternative 1 as to fire risk. If alternative incomes sources are not found or not sufficient, the greatly reduced income could affect the amount distributed to local fire districts from harvests on Forest Board lands.

Police

No change from Alternative 1.

Schools

Alternative 5 could severely restrict revenue to the Common School Construction Account and to the general fund, affecting support for school construction and other legislatively funded school needs.

Parks & Recreation facilities

Same as Alternative 1.

Communications

Alternative 5 limits communication sites to those already in place. DNR could seek new customers for these sites as leases expired but no new sites could be

offered. This alternative forecloses potential income options for the trust and counties.

Water/Storm Water Management

Not applicable.

Sewer/Solid Waste Management

No change from Alternative 1.

Other Government Services or Utilities

Not applicable.